

and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 102) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

#### NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, I voted to advance the nominations of Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE to be the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and Judge Merrick Garland to be Attorney General.

These aren't the nominees whom any Republican would have picked for these jobs, but the Nation needs Presidents to be able to stand up a team so long as their nominees are qualified and mainstream. I have voted to confirm people like Secretaries Austin, Blinken, Yellen, Vilsack, and Buttigieg. We certainly disagree on plenty of issues, but I spent 4 years watching many of our Democratic colleagues do everything possible to obstruct and delay President Trump's nominees right from the start.

Now we hear of many of the same Democrats insisting that, as a matter of principle, a new President needs his team and any delay is an outrage. It is funny how some things change. My position has not.

I am voting to confirm Judge Garland because of his long reputation as a straight shooter and a legal expert. His left-of-center perspective has been within the legal mainstream.

For the country's sake, let's hope our incoming Attorney General applies that no-nonsense approach to the serious challenges facing the Department of Justice and our Nation. Let's hope that he controls the bureaucrats and leftist subordinates that the President proposes to place under him, rather than the other way around.

When I spoke to Judge Garland, we discussed his commitment to the ongoing investigation of the events of January 6. Federal law enforcement needs to continue the work of identifying, ar-

resting, and prosecuting those who broke the law in order to disrupt the constitutional business of Congress. He assured me that will remain a priority.

At the same time, it is essential that DOJ treat political violence with equal seriousness no matter which political fringe it may come from. Last summer, riots, vandalism, and even a so-called "autonomous zone" consumed parts of American cities. In some instances, thugs directly attacked Federal property. But amazingly, some local leaders seemed more willing to tolerate the chaos than tolerate the angry tweets that leftwing activists might have sent if they had stepped in to actually do their jobs.

We were fortunate to have Attorney General Barr, who took seriously the Federal Government's role to protect Federal property and enforce Federal law. Judge Garland must be prepared to do the same.

Of course, the riots haven't been the only area where we have seen liberal governance give short shrift to the rule of law. The Obama administration was famous for its willingness to let ideology dictate the enforcement of Federal laws or the lack thereof.

Take the DACA Program, for example. When the Obama administration realized their preferred immigration policies couldn't get through Congress the right way, they stretched prosecutorial discretion and law enforcement discretion to breathtaking unconstitutional extremes. When confirmed, Judge Garland must not back other constitutionally corrosive efforts to effectively repeal laws just by ignoring them.

That brings me to the issue of immigration more broadly. Just a few weeks into the job, the Biden administration and Secretary Mayorkas are flailing and failing on our southern border. The number of unaccompanied migrant children in Border Patrol custody has tripled in just 2 weeks and now dwarfs anything seen during the last 4 years.

Like I mentioned last week, this is not an isolated question of border policy alone. The backdrop behind this entire crisis is the giant push toward amnesty and insecurity that the administration advertised throughout the campaign and every time they step to the podium now. That is what has enticed people to flood in.

Even now, administration staff keeps parroting strange lines like "Now is not the time to come." "Now is not the time to come"? Well, when is the right time to break Federal law? Is there going to be a good time to break into the country illegally, and people need to just be patient and wait for their signal? What on Earth are they talking about?

A lot of blame for this mess rests on Secretary Mayorkas himself. He spent the first weeks of his tenure downplaying and denying the crisis instead of solving it. But, again, the Biden administration's far-left approach to this issue is not limited to

DHS or to the border. Interior enforcement is a key component.

On Secretary Mayorkas' watch, we have seen what the Washington Post calls "a sharp drop" in arrests by Immigration and Customs Enforcement—a collapse of more than 60 percent from just the prior few months—a political choice, in effect, not to enforce the law.

Judge Garland must ensure the Department of Justice takes its duty to uphold the law more seriously.

Mr. President, on a related matter, after we confirm Congresswoman FUDGE and Judge Garland, the Senate will consider two nominees I will not be supporting. They both report straight to the frontlines of the new administration's leftwing war on American energy. They would work to unbalance the balancing act between conservation and the economic comeback we badly need.

To head the Environmental Protection Agency, the President has nominated Michael Regan, a longtime regulator and activist. Mr. Regan has plenty of experience. The problem is what he is poised to do with it. He and the administration are plainly prepared to put that experience behind the same far-left policies that crushed jobs and prosperity in States like Kentucky throughout the Obama administration.

The Clean Power Plan? Back on the table. The absurd waters of the United States rule? Back on the table.

Kentuckians know that when bad policies like those are on the table, it means their jobs, their livelihoods, and their communities are on the menu.

Congresswoman HAALAND, the President's pick to lead the Department of the Interior, was literally an original cosponsor of the Green New Deal. She has vowed to "keep fossil fuels in the ground" and once pledged "to vote against all new fossil fuel infrastructure."

Her record and her views ignore the fact that American energy independence fueled prosperity for the working class and middle class over the last 4 years. Yet in multiple of those years, our carbon emissions actually went down—went down. The supposed choice between a clean environment and domestic energy independence is a false choice. It only exists as a zero-sum tradeoff in the minds of Democrats.

We have every reason to believe that voting for Mr. Regan and Representative HAALAND would be voting to raise gas prices for families who are already struggling, voting to raise fuel and heating bills for seniors on a fixed income, voting to take the tough times we have been going through and making them even tougher.

I will be voting for American families and against both of their nominations.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of MARCIA LOUISE FUDGE, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

## IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for 20 years now, I have come to this floor hundreds of times to speak on behalf of the DREAM Act, which I introduced long ago. During that period of time, I have had an occasional vote. I have not been successful in making it the law of the land.

The closest I came was about 8 years ago, when we had the comprehensive immigration reform bill. Four Democratic Senators and four Republican Senators—and I was among them—worked for months to try to address our immigration system. We came up with an agreement that was no mean feat. It is a complex area of law. It is a controversial area of law. It is an area of law that changes almost by the day, and we were trying to find a solution to all the challenges it presents.

To think that we are a nation of immigrants and, then, to reflect on our history on immigration is to leave one puzzled.

Most of the time we have been against immigration, despite the arrival of good people on our borders. Occasionally, when we were building a transcontinental railroad, we would invite people from China in to take the backbreaking jobs, only to categorically exclude them from immigration in the meantime. It is hard to explain, understand, or appreciate where we stand on immigration.

When I hear the Republican leader come to the floor and criticize President Obama for DACA, I have to say that it is personal to me. I was writing letters to President Biden, my former Senate colleague from Illinois, begging him to do just that, and he did.

In creating DACA, he gave the Dreamers a fighting chance, and more than 800,000 of them came forward. These were young people who were brought to the United States as toddlers and infants and children, not because of a personal decision but a family decision. They grew up here, went to school here, and believed they were a part of this country, only to learn in a quiet moment of honesty from their parents that they didn't have the necessary paperwork and they had to be extra careful or face deportation.

I thought that was a heartbreaking conclusion for their time in America and introduced the Dream Act. And when we could not pass it, I asked

President Obama to do what he could to help, and he did. I thank him for it still to this day.

But DACA, if it was stretching Executive power, was certainly reflective of where the American people are on this issue. No apologies; the American people don't hold these young children now grown responsible for their family's decision. They want to give them a chance. They want to give them a chance to earn their legal status, to earn a path to citizenship. No apologies here; these are wonderful young people who make America a better country, and we need them to be a part of our future.

So for those who come to the floor critical of DACA, I just tell you: Take a couple of minutes and meet these young people. I have come to the floor over a hundred times telling their personal stories. They are a great source of pride, not just for me but for this Nation.

Now we face problems on our border—and we have for some time—and they are challenges that are very real. Mr. Mayorkas has taken over as the head of the Department of Homeland Security. He is a person I willingly and anxiously support for that job. He has a personal family story of immigration, but, more importantly, he has a depth of experience that is almost impossible to find in other places.

He has tried to come together with the leaders in Central America to fashion a plan for order on the border, and it is difficult. It is true that larger numbers are coming to the border at this time. The Senator from Kentucky said earlier that they believe they have a right to break Federal law. I couldn't disagree with him more. They are presenting themselves at the border under the law of asylum in the United States so that they can be judged as to whether or not they are eligible to come into this country. That is the process, but it has broken down because the numbers presenting themselves at the border and the backlog of cases, more than a million cases pending.

We don't have enough judges. We don't have a procedure that is sensible and humane. We need all of that, and it is not going to happen the day after tomorrow. Part of it depends on us. It is one thing to come to the floor and lament the situation of immigration in our country. It is another to roll up your sleeves and say: Let's do it; let's solve it on a bipartisan basis. And it is certainly an imperative in a 50–50 Senate that any immigration legislation be done on a bipartisan basis.

I stand ready to do that as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and I think colleagues on the Republican side agree with me. As tough as it may be, we need to tackle these issues and not ignore them as they have been ignored during the last 4 years. That is going to call for some cooperation and some compromise on both sides, but we owe it to our country to do the right thing to make our immigration system sensible, logical, and fair.

I don't want to go back to those moments under the Trump administration of zero tolerance, where over 2,000 children were forcibly removed from their parents, sent into a bureaucratic "Never Never Land" and then were only reunited—and not all of them have been—those who were reunited were because of a Federal court order calling on the Trump administration to do it.

They cast those children adrift in the bureaucracy. It wasn't until the Federal court demanded that they be reinstated with their families that it happened—in most instances but not in all of them. So we have a lot of work to do, and I hope we can do it on a bipartisan basis. We need to do it as quickly as we can on a bipartisan basis.

## 56TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

Mr. President, I was a college student in town here at Georgetown University, and I can remember it well. You have a lot of time to talk with your roommates about things that you might just do with your life and things that you should do, even as a student. I remember that week before the march on Selma, there was a serious conversation among my roommates as to whether we ought to pack up and head to Selma, AL, to join in the march. We were serious about it. We thought about it, but, in the end, it fell through. Too many classes would be cut and jobs we wouldn't be attending to, and we decided at the last minute it just wasn't practical at all for us to do it. I regret that decision to this day. I wish I had been there, even if I were in the back of the line, to say I was part of that day in history.

It was 56 years ago last Sunday, some 600 civil rights activists, 56 years ago, were kneeling in prayer outside the Brown Chapel AME Church in Selma. Leading them was our dearly departed friend—and I know he was the Presiding Officer's friend as well—and former colleague John Lewis. As they stood up outside the church, they formed two rows and began a silent, orderly march toward Montgomery, AL. We all remember that photo of John Lewis coming over that bridge in his tan raincoat and his backpack.

As the civil rights activists reached the Edmund Pettus Bridge, they were met by a phalanx of State troopers and armed vigilantes. They wielded cattle prods, billy clubs, shotguns, and other makeshift weapons. We all know what happened next. Today, that violence is remembered as "Bloody Sunday."

What some may not know is what happened the night before that march. The county sheriff in Selma, Jim Clark, had issued a call to arms. He ordered White men in the area to join troopers in Selma, and he deputized those people to help stop the march. They answered the call, lining up by the hundreds alongside the State troopers.

John Lewis and his fellow patriots were not going to be intimidated. They